

OLC First Cycle Grant Application Evaluation Process: An Overview

To evaluate applications received for California Reading and Literacy Improvement and Public Library Construction and Renovation Bond Act of 2000 grant funds, the California State Library's Office of Library Construction developed the following evaluation process incorporating the review factors found in the Bond Act and its regulations¹.

Evaluation elements based on the Title 5 Regulations were developed for each type of project: 1st priority new library, 2nd priority new library, 1st priority remodeling of an existing library, and 2nd priority remodeling of an existing library. Applications were divided into the categories according to project type. For the first application cycle, there were no applications for 1st priority remodeling of an existing library.

All evaluation elements fell into one of the review factors specified in the Bond Act. Factors that were rated by the evaluation panel were: age and condition of an existing library; needs of residents of the service area and the response of the proposed project to the needs; integration of appropriate technology into the plan of service; and appropriateness of the proposed site for the project. The *Application Evaluation Chart* that follows summarizes in more detail the review factors, rating elements, methodology, and rating categories.

The evaluation panel for the first cycle of funding for was comprised of four OLC staff members who have MLS degrees: three Library Program Consultants and the Deputy Library Bond Act Manager. This group represents a broad range of library backgrounds and perspectives. Each panel member completed a separate evaluation form for each eligible application. The table entitled *Evaluation Forms Combined to Obtain Overall Rating* indicates how evaluation forms were combined according to the Bond Act review factors.

After all panel members had completed their individual evaluations, ratings were averaged. The overall rating for each application was determined according to the *Overall Rating Determination Guidelines*. These guidelines appear following the *Application Evaluation Chart*.

OLC staff prepared an *Individual Application Summary*, a two-page summary of each proposed project. The summary contains information compiled from application documents submitted by the applicant, average ratings for the Bond Act factors, a summary of the review panel's comments, and the overall rating for the application.

¹California Code of Regulations Title 5, Section 19998 (a). See Appendix 1.

***OLC First Cycle Grant Application
Evaluation Process:
An Overview
Application Evaluation Chart***

<i>BOND ACT FACTOR</i>	<i>ELEMENTS</i>	<i>METHODOLOGY</i>	<i>RATING CATEGORIES</i>
<i>Needs of urban and rural areas</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location of project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maps created to show the location of each project within the state 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not rated
<i>Population growth</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1980 population • Projected 2020 population 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of population change was calculated from information listed on the Application Form 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not rated
<i>Age and condition of existing library</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dates of library construction and building renovation • Physical condition of the existing library: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ <i>Structural</i> ♦ <i>Lighting</i> ♦ <i>Energy</i> ♦ <i>Health and safety</i> ♦ <i>ADA</i> ♦ <i>Acoustical</i> ♦ <i>Flexibility</i> ♦ <i>Spatial relationships</i> ♦ <i>Site considerations</i> • If Joint Use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ <i>Separate ratings for existing school library</i> • If Renovation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ <i>Feasibility study</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ages of library facilities and renovation dates were ranked, oldest-to-newest and divided into five groups • Review of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Community Library Needs Assessment section concerning existing library facility ♦ Visual record of existing library 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratings from 4-0* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ No existing library ♦ Poor Condition ♦ Acceptable Condition ♦ Good Condition ♦ Very Good Condition <p>* Because this category assists in demonstrating the need for a new or improved facility, an existing library in very good condition rates lower than one in poor condition.</p>

OLC First Cycle Grant Application Evaluation Process: An Overview

<i>BOND ACT FACTOR</i>	<i>ELEMENTS</i>	<i>METHODOLOGY</i>	<i>RATING CATEGORIES</i>
<i>Inadequacy of the existing library in meeting the needs of residents and the response of proposed project to meeting the needs</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determination of the needs of residents of the library service area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ <i>Needs Assessment methodology and community involvement</i> ♦ <i>Community analysis/community agencies and organizations, service area demographics</i> ♦ <i>Analysis of service needs/consistency with demographics</i> ♦ <i>Service limitations for existing facility (if applicable)</i> ♦ <i>Space Needs Assessment</i> ♦ <i>If joint use:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Analysis of the needs of K-12 student population</i> • Library services planned to respond to the specific clientele and community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ <i>How the proposed project responds to the needs of the residents</i> ♦ <i>How well the mission, roles, goals, objectives and service indicators are documented</i> ♦ <i>How well types of services to be offered are documented.</i> ♦ <i>How projects fit into jurisdiction-wide plan of service</i> ♦ <i>If joint use:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>How well the project responds to the needs of the K-12 students as expressed in the Needs Assessment</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of narrative information submitted in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Community Library Needs Assessment ♦ Library Plan of Service ♦ Library Building Program ♦ Conceptual Drawings • As applicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ If joint use, Joint Use Cooperative Agreement ♦ If renovation, structural and other studies ♦ If leased site, lease/lease purchase agreements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratings from 4-0: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Outstanding ♦ Very Good ♦ Acceptable ♦ Limitations ♦ Serious Limitations

OLC First Cycle Grant Application Evaluation Process: An Overview

<i>BOND ACT FACTOR</i>	<i>ELEMENTS</i>	<i>METHODOLOGY</i>	<i>RATING CATEGORIES</i>
<i>Inadequacy of the existing library in meeting the needs of residents and the response of proposed project to meeting the needs (Continued)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>How well the types of K-12 services are documented</i> ▪ <i>How well the school library mission, roles, goals, and objectives are documented</i> • Physical space planned to accommodate needed services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Library Building Program <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>How well building program implements plan of service</i> ▪ <i>How well building program documents general requirements for library building</i> ▪ <i>How well the spatial relationships are described</i> ▪ <i>How well individual spaces are sized and described</i> ♦ Conceptual Plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>How well the net-assignable square footage on plan matches the Building Program, Plan of Service and Needs Assessment</i> ▪ <i>How well the non-assignable square footage on plan matches the Building Program, Plan of Service and Needs Assessment</i> ▪ <i>How well the spatial relationships on plan match what was called for in the Building Program, Plan of Service and Needs Assessment</i> 		

OLC First Cycle Grant Application Evaluation Process: An Overview

<i>BOND ACT FACTOR</i>	<i>ELEMENTS</i>	<i>METHODOLOGY</i>	<i>RATING CATEGORIES</i>
<i>Inadequacy of the existing library in meeting the needs of residents and the response of proposed project to meeting the needs (Continued)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>How well the elevations, sections, and specifications demonstrate implementation the Building Program and Plan of Service</i> • If joint use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Joint Use Cooperative Agreement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>How well roles and responsibilities are defined</i> ▪ <i>How clearly the joint library services are described</i> ▪ <i>Appropriateness, adequacy, and reasonableness of hours of service</i> ▪ <i>Appropriateness, adequacy, and reasonableness of staffing / volunteers</i> ▪ <i>How well are ownership issues are resolved</i> ▪ <i>Appropriateness, adequacy, and reasonableness of sources and uses of funding</i> ▪ <i>Appropriateness, adequacy, and reasonableness of review and modification process</i> ▪ <i>How well the agreement demonstrates a workable, mutually beneficial long term partnership</i> 		

***OLC First Cycle Grant Application
Evaluation Process:
An Overview***

<i>BOND ACT FACTOR</i>	<i>ELEMENTS</i>	<i>METHODOLOGY</i>	<i>RATING CATEGORIES</i>
<i>Plan of Service integrates appropriate electronic technology</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application of technology appropriate to the needs of the service area residents is used to deliver required/desired library services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ <i>Appropriateness of the electronic technologies in the Plan of Service, based on Needs Assessment</i> ♦ <i>How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in the Plan of Service</i> ♦ <i>How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in the building program</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of narrative information submitted in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Library Plan of Service ♦ Library Building Program ♦ Conceptual Drawings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratings from 4-0: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Outstanding ♦ Very Good ♦ Acceptable ♦ Limitations ♦ Serious Limitations

OLC First Cycle Grant Application Evaluation Process: An Overview

<i>BOND ACT FACTOR</i>	<i>ELEMENTS</i>	<i>METHODOLOGY</i>	<i>RATING CATEGORIES</i>
<i>Appropriateness of site for the proposed project</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is appropriate for the needs of this library clientele and the proposed facility ♦ Appropriateness of site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Equal access for all residents in service area</i> ▪ <i>Accessibility via public transit</i> ▪ <i>Accessibility to pedestrians and bicycles</i> ▪ <i>Accessibility via automobile</i> ▪ <i>Adequacy of automobile parking</i> ▪ <i>Adequacy of bicycle parking</i> ▪ <i>Overall Parking Rationale</i> ▪ <i>Shared Parking Agreement (If Applicable)</i> ▪ <i>Visibility of site and proposed library building in service area</i> ▪ <i>How well site fits community context and planning</i> ▪ <i>Site selection process and summary</i> ♦ Site Description <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Adequacy of the size of the site</i> ▪ <i>Appropriateness of site configuration</i> ▪ <i>Appropriateness of site / surrounding area</i> ▪ <i>Appropriateness of site based on the placement of the building, parking, access roads, pathways, expansion and parking</i> ▪ <i>Drainage</i> ▪ <i>Geotechnical Report</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Narrative information submitted in Application Form ♦ Visual record of the site ♦ Boundary survey ♦ Site plan ♦ Area plan ♦ Area map showing site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratings from 4-0: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Outstanding ♦ Very Good ♦ Acceptable ♦ Limitations ♦ Serious Limitations • (Reviewed, but not rated) • (Reviewed, but not rated)

***OLC First Cycle Grant Application
Evaluation Process:
An Overview***

<i>BOND ACT FACTOR</i>	<i>ELEMENTS</i>	<i>METHODOLOGY</i>	<i>RATING CATEGORIES</i>
<i>Financial capacity of applicant to open and maintain operation of the library (new public libraries only)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Library Operating Budget • Narrative statements regarding financial capacity • Resolution of applicant's governing body • Resolution of the operating jurisdiction, if not the applicant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ♦ Information submitted in the Application Form ♦ Resolutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Reviewed, but not rated)

OLC First Cycle Grant Application Evaluation Process: An Overview

Evaluation Forms Combined to Obtain Overall Rating

<i>Review Criteria</i>	<i>Evaluation Forms Combined</i> <i>(As they apply to project type)</i>
Population Growth	AA
Age and Condition	A B C D E
Needs of residents/response of proposed project to needs	F G H I J K
Plan of service integrates appropriate technology	L
Appropriateness of site	M N
Financial capacity (new libraries only)	O

OLC First Cycle Grant Application Evaluation Process: An Overview

OVERALL RATING DETERMINATION GUIDELINES

Overall Ratings are assigned using the highest possible rating, according to the following rules:

OUTSTANDING

- At least 3 ratings of Outstanding
- The 4th rating no lower than Acceptable

VERY GOOD

- At least 3 ratings no lower than Very Good
- The 4th rating no lower than Acceptable

ACCEPTABLE

- At least 3 ratings no lower than Acceptable
- The 4th rating no lower than Limitations

LIMITATIONS

- No rating lower than Limitations

SERIOUS LIMITATIONS

- At least one rating of Serious Limitations in any category

OLC Grant Application Evaluation Process Overview

Appendix 1: Education Code Section 19998 (a)

Sec. 19998. Consideration in reviewing applications.

(a) In reviewing applications, as part of establishing the priorities set forth in Section 19994 the board shall consider all of the following factors:

- (1) Needs of urban and rural areas.
- (2) Population growth.
- (3) Age and condition of the existing library facility.
- (4) The degree to which the existing library facility is inadequate in meeting the needs of the residents in the library service area and the degree to which the proposed project responds to the needs of those residents.
- (5) The degree to which the library's plan of service integrates appropriate electronic technologies into the proposed project.
- (6) The degree to which the proposed site is appropriate for the proposed project and its intended use.
- (7) The financial capacity of the local agency submitting the application to open and maintain operation of the proposed library for applications for the construction of new public libraries.